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ABSTRACT

This paper concerns the evaluation of a guidance and control system for lunar landing. The lander, which is supposed to have the same configuration of SELENE-B (SELenological and ENgineering Explorer-B), is required to land precisely at a site where there are scientifically important features, with minimal fuel consumption while avoiding surface obstacles such as rocks and small craters which might jeopardize the landing. The guidance and control system are designed for this aim, and the feasibility of the landing is tested by Monte Carlo simulation. The results, however, indicated that the original configuration and landing sequence are not appropriate for precise and safe landing. Therefore, based on the results, the configuration and landing sequence are modified and tested by Monte Carlo simulation again.
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要 約
本論文は、月面精密着陸に必要な誘導制御則について論ずる。取り扱う月面軟着陸機は、以前提案されていったSELENE-B（月面着陸実験計画）と同じ構成を持つと仮定する。着陸機は、岩石や小さなクレータ等の危険な場所を避けつつ、科学的に意義のある地点へ精密に着陸することが要求される。本稿では、これを満足する着陸誘導制御則を設計し、モンテカルロシミュレーションによって評価を行う。SELENE-Bと同じ構成及び着陸シーケンスでは、安全かつ精密な着陸は難しいことをシミュレーションで示し、その結果を受けて構成等に変更を加え、更なるシミュレーションで精密着陸の成立性を検証する。

1. Introduction

The moon is recognized as an important destination for space science and exploration [1]. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has presented a new policy [2] for space exploration that includes human expedition to the lunar surface. The European Space Agency (ESA) and other agencies have also planned to send spacecraft to the moon and some of these projects are now in progress [3].

The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) released its long-term vision called “JAXA Vision” [4] in March 2006, in which the development and demonstration of technologies for lunar exploration will be achieved within about 10 years. JAXA will launch Japan’s first large lunar orbiter, SELENE (SELenological and ENgineering Explorer), in 2007 [5], and a lunar landing mission which aims to send an unmanned lander to the lunar surface is being studied as a follow-on mission [6]. The lander is required to land precisely at a site that has scientifically
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interesting features. This may be, however, impossible if there are obstacles such as large rocks and small craters that prevent a safe landing there. Therefore, the lander is required to find an obstacle-free area as close as possible to the original target site and to land there safely. A major technical research subject of the mission is thus the development of technology to achieve this.

This paper is concerned with a guidance and control system for precise and safe landing. The amount of fuel that can be carried is strictly limited due to mission payload constraints. Thus, a guidance strategy that minimizes fuel consumption is essential. The guidance and control system is designed for this aim, and the feasibility of the landing is tested by Monte Carlo simulation, which is often used to evaluate the robustness of flight systems against various uncertainties. Monte Carlo simulation is able to evaluate nonlinear systems directly, and its results reflect the influences of various combinations of uncertain parameters. Firstly we show the results of the simulation using the “SELENE-B” configuration and the landing sequence studied in 2002. The results make it clear that the original configuration and the landing sequence are not appropriate for precise and safe landing. And then the simulation results using the modified configuration are shown.

This paper is organized as follows. The original configuration and landing sequence of “SELENE-B” are described in Section 2. The proposed guidance and control system is presented in Section 3. Section 4 shows the Monte Carlo simulation results using the original configuration. Based on the results, we modify the configuration and landing sequence with which we show the simulation results in Section 5.

Figure 1: Conceptual design of the lunar lander and its body-fixed coordinates (From “proposal of the SELENE-B mission” [6]).

**Notation**

$\phi, \theta, \psi$: attitude angles

$P, Q, R$: angular velocities

$T_r, T_s, T_z$: RCS torques

$T$: main engine thrust

$m$: mass of the lander

$m_e$: estimated mass

$\alpha_r$: thrust duty cycle

$T_{on}$: minimum on-time of the main engine

$T_{off}$: minimum off-time of the main engine

$\text{Isp}$: specific impulse of the main engine

$g$: gravitational acceleration

$g_{moon}$: gravitational acceleration on the moon (assumed to be a constant)

$\{ \cdot \}_l$: a state variable defined in the lunar local coordinates

$\{ \cdot \}_b$: a state variable defined in the body-fixed coordinates

$\{ \cdot \}_r$: a state variable defined in the reference trajectory coordinates

$\{ \cdot \}_c$: a command output from the guidance system

$\{ \cdot \}_r$: a state variable of the reference trajectory

2. Preliminaries

2.1 Configuration of the Lander

The lunar lander considered here is shown in Figure 1. It is equipped with twelve reaction control system (RCS) thrusters for attitude control and a 1,700N main thruster. The attitude of the lander around each axis is always controlled by two pairs of RCS thruster (one pair for the plus direction and the other for the minus direction) in order to generate a “pure” torque without a linear force. Since it has no direct translation control force in the horizontal plane, the lander must tilt to use the resulting sideways

Table 1: Major lander characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial mass</td>
<td>600[kg]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial descending velocity</td>
<td>-40[m/sec]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll inertia moment</td>
<td>228.2[kg/m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch inertia moment</td>
<td>170.1[kg/m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaw inertia moment</td>
<td>168.9[kg/m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main thrust</td>
<td>1,700[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main thrust ISP</td>
<td>316[sec]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum RCS thrust</td>
<td>40[N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per one thruster)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of RCS moment arm</td>
<td>1[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS ISP</td>
<td>280[sec]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Landing Sequence

The landing sequence after de-orbit is divided into the following two phases: a powered descent phase during which the lander cancels its large horizontal velocity, and a vertical descent phase (below 3,500m altitude) during which the lander must detect and avoid obstacles on the lunar surface. This paper deals with only the vertical descent phase. The landing sequence of the vertical descent phase is divided into the following five subphases considering the performance of the imaging sensor used for obstacle detection.

- Initial error accommodation (3,500m-500m altitude): Navigation error accumulated during de-orbit is accommodated in this subphase. The maximum necessary shift in horizontal position is estimated to be 500m.
- Rough obstacle avoidance (500 m-100m): Larger obstacles can be detected at an altitude of 500m. During this subphase, the lander moves to a safe landing location to avoid large obstacles. A maximum horizontal shift of 250m is assumed.
- Precise obstacle avoidance (100m-10m): During this subphase, the lander avoids smaller obstacles detected from an altitude of 100m. A maximum horizontal shift of 75m is assumed. Considering the final freefall subphase, the descent velocity at the end of this subphase is set at around 1.5m/sec.
- Constant speed descent (10m-2m): This subphase is introduced in consideration of altitude navigation error. The lander descends vertically at a constant speed of around 1.5m/sec in order to avoid crashing into the lunar surface.
- Freefall (2m-0m): To avoid stirring up lunar surface material (regolith) by using the main thruster near the surface, the main thruster is stopped at an altitude of 2m and the lander then freefalls to the surface. If the descent speed at main thruster cut-off is around 1.5m/sec, the lander will touch down within about 2 seconds at a vertical speed of about 3 m/s, which is within the limits of the vehicle’s undercarriage.

2.3 Navigation System

The navigation system in this paper comprises an inertial measurement unit (IMU), a radio altimeter/velocimeter (RA/RV), and a Kalman navigation filter. The RA/RV can operate down to 30m altitude. The outputs of the IMU and RA/RV are integrated, and position, velocity, and attitude errors are estimated by the Kalman filter. These estimated state variables are used by the guidance and control system. Details of the navigation system have been published in previous papers [6][7].

2.4 Obstacle Detection System

Obstacles on the lunar surface are detected using a stereo imaging sensor. At the start of the rough obstacle avoidance and precise obstacle avoidance subphases, the obstacle detection system senses large rocks and small craters below the lander which may endanger landing, and identifies an obstacle-free area wide enough for landing in the neighborhood of the original target site. The objective point of each subphase, to which the guidance and control system guides the lander, is set to exactly above the center of the obstacle-free area. The system is activated only when the main thruster is not firing in order to avoid faeier’s influence over the stereo imaging sensor.

2.5 Coordinate Systems

A number of coordinate systems are used in this paper. Conversion between these coordinate systems is accomplished by transformation matrices.

2.5.1 Lunar Local Coordinates

Assuming the curvature of the lunar surface around the target site to be negligible, a lunar local coordinate system is defined as follows:

- $x$": a vertical unit vector pointing downward the lunar surface.
- $y$": a unit vector pointing east.
- $z$": a unit vector pointing north.

Its origin is the projection of the initial position of the lander at the start of the current subphase to the lunar surface. A vector in lunar local coordinates is denoted with a superscript $l$. 
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2.5.2 Body-Fixed Coordinates

A body-fixed coordinate system is defined as shown in Figure 1. Its origin is at lander’s center of mass. A vector in body-fixed coordinates \( r' \) is transformed to a vector in lunar local coordinates \( r \) by the following transformation matrix \( C_1^0 \):

\[
C_1^0 = \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \phi & -\cos \theta \sin \phi & \sin \theta \\
\cos \theta \sin \phi & \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\
-\sin \phi & \sin \theta \sin \phi & \cos \theta \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \phi, \theta \) and \( \psi \) denote the roll, pitch and yaw angles of the lander respectively.

2.5.3 Target Attitude Coordinates

The target attitude coordinate system is the body-fixed coordinate system at the target attitude. It is defined using the target attitude angles which are calculated by the guidance system and denoted as \( \phi_a, \theta_a \), and \( \psi_a \). A vector in this coordinate is expressed with a superscript \( a \). The transformation matrix \( C_1^a \) (\( \phi_a, \theta_a, \psi_a \)) is defined in the same way as \( C_1^0 \).

2.5.4 Reference Trajectory Coordinates

The guidance system reference trajectory is determined in a plane normal to the lunar surface and includes the initial point and objective points of the lander in the current subphase. This coordinate system is defined in order to generate the reference trajectory. Its origin is the projection of the initial point of the current subphase to the lunar surface. The \( x \) axis is the same direction of \( x' \), the \( y \) axis points towards the projection of the objective point to the lunar surface, and the \( z \) axis is defined to make a right-handed coordinate system. State variables in the reference trajectory coordinate system are shown with a superscript \( g \). This coordinate system is transformed to the lunar local coordinate system using the transformation matrix \( C_g^0 \), which is calculated using the initial position \( (x'_0, y'_0) \) and final position \( (x'_f, y'_f) \) of the lander in the lunar coordinate system:

\[
C_g^0(\phi_g) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \cos \phi_g & -\sin \phi_g \\
0 & \sin \phi_g & \cos \phi_g \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \phi_g = \tan^{-1}\left( \frac{x'_f - x'_0}{y'_f - y'_0} \right) \).

3. Guidance and Control System

3.1 Overview

The guidance and control system of the lander consists of six modules:

- subphase management
- reference trajectory generation
- guidance to the reference trajectory
- main thrust modulation
- attitude control
- mass estimation

Figure 2 depicts the relationships among these modules. The basic concept of the system is as follows [8]. At the start of each subphase, the objective point at the end of the subphase is decided by the obstacle detection system, and the reference trajectory to the point is calculated so as to minimize fuel consumption during the landing sequence. Then, during the subphase, attitude and thrust are controlled so that the lander follows the reference trajectory. The function of each module is explained briefly in the following subsections.

![Figure 2: Guidance and control system modules.](image)

3.2 Subphase Management

This module supervises the current subphase in the landing sequence and the current state parameters (position, velocity, attitude, etc.) estimated by the navigation system. The subphase is determined by current altitude (see section 2.2). When the subphase changes, this module invokes the reference trajectory generation module to obtain the calculated reference trajectory parameters.

The subphase management module also counts elapsed time from the start of the current subphase, which is used in the guidance to the reference trajectory module.
3.3 Reference Trajectory Generation

The reference trajectory is determined as the minimum fuel trajectory from the initial point to the objective point of the current subphase. It is determined in the reference trajectory coordinate system, which helps to reduce the amount of computation required.

For each subphase, the initial state and final position are input to this module, whereas the module can choose the final velocity. Although the reference trajectory is designed to optimize fuel consumption, it is desirable to reduce the amount of computation required to allow the algorithm to be implemented in the lander, and so a number of simplifying assumptions are made. Firstly, the thruster can generate arbitrary thrust up to the maximum thrust. Since thrust \( T \) is always divided by mass \( m \) in the equations of motion, \( T/m \) is treated as one variable \( (\omega) \) and assumed not to change during a subphase. This simplification helps to solve the optimization problem easily. Secondly, the attitude angle in reference trajectory coordinates is assumed to be fixed at \( \Psi \) during the horizontal acceleration, and at \(-\Psi\) during horizontal deceleration. The attitude angle is limited up to \( \bar{\Psi} \), and the attitude angle ratio is set to be maximum value \( (\pm \omega) \) so that the lander can follow the reference trajectory. In this study we set:

\[
\bar{\Psi} = 30[^\circ], \quad \bar{\omega} = 5.0[^\circ/sec].
\]

3.3.1 Coordinate transformation

As is mentioned in the previous section, the reference trajectory is defined in the reference trajectory coordinate system. Since the subphase management module uses the lunar local coordinate system, it is necessary to apply a coordinate transformation to the initial position \( * \), initial velocity \( \upsilon_\perp \) and final position \( * \) of the current subphase:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\bar{x}_i \\
\bar{y}_i \\
\bar{z}_i
\end{bmatrix} = C_{\Psi}^{\top} \begin{bmatrix}
\bar{x}'_i - 0 \\
\bar{y}'_i - \bar{y}_i \\
\bar{z}'_i - \bar{z}_i
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\bar{x}_i \\
\bar{y}_i \\
\bar{z}_i
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
(C_{\Psi}^{\top} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix})
\]

Since all state variables concerned with this module are defined in the reference trajectory coordinate system, the superscript \( g \) is omitted in the following sections for simplicity.

3.3.2 Reference Trajectory generation

There are two types of candidate trajectory for the reference trajectory.

Type 1: horizontal acceleration and deceleration

Type 2: horizontal deceleration only

Although the former type of trajectory can move the lander to a farther area regardless of the initial horizontal velocity, some time is necessary to change the lander's attitude to alter the horizontal thrust component to accelerate and decelerate. As a result, this trajectory has an unreachable area which can actually be reached with shorter time acceleration. The latter type of trajectory allows this unreachable area to be covered.

Trajectory type 1: horizontal acceleration and deceleration

At the start of the subphase, the lander is in freefall \( (t_\text{f}, \text{sec}) \). It then accelerates \( (t_\text{a}, \text{sec}) \) and decelerates \( (t_\text{d}, \text{sec}) \) horizontally.

Step 1: Freefall \( (t \leq t_\text{f}) \)

The lander freefalls for \( t_\text{f} \) seconds. This step is necessary since the main thruster should not fire in the beginning of the subphase in order to activate the obstacle detection system. During this step, the reference trajectory is expressed as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_i(t) &= 0, \\
R_i(t) &= 0, \\
v_{x,i}(t) &= v_{x,i} - x_0, \\
v_{y,i}(t) &= v_{y,i}, \\
x_i(t) &= x_i + v_{x,i}t - \frac{1}{2}g_x t^2, \\
y_i(t) &= y_i + v_{y,i}t,
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_i(t) &: \text{ reference angle,} \\
R_i(t) &: \text{ reference rate,} \\
v_{x,i}(t), v_{y,i}(t) &: \text{ reference velocity,} \\
x_i(t), y_i(t) &: \text{ reference position,}
\end{align*}
\]

(in the reference trajectory plane).
Step 2: Transition to horizontal acceleration ($t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + \delta t$, where $\delta t = \frac{\alpha}{\omega}$)

The lander changes its attitude with constant angular velocity $\omega$ [rad/sec] until it turns to $\Psi$ [rad].

Let $x_0$, $y_0$, $v_{x_0}$, $v_{y_0}$ be the position and velocity at the end of the $k$th step, and $\tau_k$ be the elapsed time in the $k$th step (e.g. $\tau_2 = t - t_0$). Then the reference trajectory is expressed as follows:

$$R_x(\tau_2) = s_1 \omega,$$

$$v_{x_0}(\tau_2) = v_{x_0} - g_n \tau_2 + \frac{a}{\omega} \sin \omega \tau_2,$$

$$v_{y_0}(\tau_2) = v_{y_0} + \frac{a}{\omega} (1 - \cos \omega \tau_2),$$

$$x_1(\tau_2) = x_1 + v_{x_0} \tau_2 - \frac{1}{2} g_n \tau_2^2 + \frac{a}{\omega} (1 - \cos \omega \tau_2),$$

$$y_1(\tau_2) = y_1 + v_{y_0} \tau_2 + \frac{a}{\omega} \sin \omega \tau_2,$$

where

$$s_1 = \text{sign}(\Psi),$$

$$a = T \frac{m \times F_x}{m} = \alpha \cdot I_{sp} \cdot g.$$

Step 3: Horizontal acceleration ($t_0 + \delta t \leq t \leq t_0 + \delta t + t_0$)

The lander accelerates for $t_0$ seconds.

$$\psi(\tau_3) = \Psi,$$

$$R_x(\tau_3) = 0,$$

$$v_{x_0}(\tau_3) = v_{x_0} + (a \cos \Psi - g_n) \tau_3,$$

$$v_{y_0}(\tau_3) = v_{y_0} + a \sin \Psi \tau_3,$$

$$x_1(\tau_3) = x_1 + v_{x_0} \tau_3 + \frac{1}{2} (a \cos \Psi - g_n) \tau_3^2,$$

$$y_1(\tau_3) = y_1 + v_{y_0} \tau_3 + \frac{1}{2} a \sin \Psi \tau_3^2,$$

$$(\tau_3 = t - t_1 - \delta t).$$

Step 4: Transition to horizontal deceleration ($t_0 + \delta t + t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + 3\delta t + t_0$)

To decelerate, the lander changes its attitude with constant angular velocity $-\omega$ [rad/sec] until it turns to $-\Psi$. 

$$\psi(\tau_4) = s_1 (\Psi - \omega \tau_4),$$

$$R_x(\tau_4) = -s_1 \omega,$$

$$v_{x_0}(\tau_4) = v_{x_0} - g_n \tau_4 - \frac{a}{\omega} \sin (\Psi - \omega \tau_4) - \sin (\Psi),$$

$$v_{y_0}(\tau_4) = v_{y_0} + \frac{a}{\omega} \cos (\Psi - \omega \tau_4) - \cos (\Psi),$$

$$x_1(\tau_4) = x_1 + v_{x_0} \tau_4 - \frac{1}{2} g_n \tau_4^2 - \frac{a}{\omega} \cos (\Psi - \omega \tau_4) - \cos (\Psi),$$

$$y_1(\tau_4) = y_1 + v_{y_0} \tau_4 + \frac{a}{\omega} \sin (\Psi - \omega \tau_4) - \sin (\Psi),$$

$$(\tau_4 = t - t_1 - 3\delta t - t_0).$$

Step 5: Horizontal deceleration ($t_0 + 3\delta t + t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + 3\delta t + t_0 + t_0$)

The lander decelerates for $t_0$ seconds.

$$\psi(\tau_5) = -s_1 (\Psi - \omega \tau_5),$$

$$R_x(\tau_5) = s_1 \omega,$$

$$v_{x_0}(\tau_5) = v_{x_0} + (a \cos \Psi - g_n) \tau_5,$$

$$v_{y_0}(\tau_5) = v_{y_0} - a \sin \Psi \tau_5,$$

$$x_1(\tau_5) = x_1 + v_{x_0} \tau_5 \frac{1}{2} (a \cos \Psi - g_n) \tau_5^2,$$

$$y_1(\tau_5) = y_1 + v_{y_0} \tau_5 \frac{1}{2} a \sin \Psi \tau_5^2,$$

$$(\tau_5 = t - t_1 - 3\delta t - t_0).$$

Step 6: Transition to the next subphase ($t_0 + 3\delta t + t_0 + t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + 4\delta t + t_0 + t_0$)

The lander stops decelerating and returns to a vertical attitude with constant angular velocity $-\omega$ [rad/sec].

$$\psi(\tau_6) = -s_1 (\Psi - \omega \tau_6),$$

$$R_x(\tau_6) = s_1 \omega,$$

$$v_{x_0}(\tau_6) = v_{x_0} - g_n \tau_6 - \frac{a}{\omega} \sin (\Psi - \omega \tau_6) - \sin (\Psi),$$

$$v_{y_0}(\tau_6) = v_{y_0} - \frac{a}{\omega} \cos (\Psi - \omega \tau_6) - \cos (\Psi),$$

$$x_1(\tau_6) = x_1 + v_{x_0} \tau_6 - \frac{1}{2} g_n \tau_6^2$$

$$- \frac{a}{\omega} \cos (\Psi - \omega \tau_6) - \cos (\Psi),$$

$$y_1(\tau_6) = y_1 + v_{y_0} \tau_6 + \frac{1}{2} a \sin \Psi \tau_6^2$$

$$+ \frac{a}{\omega} \sin (\Psi - \omega \tau_6) - \sin (\Psi),$$

$$(\tau_6 = t - t_1 - 3\delta t - t_0).$$

Step 7: Altitude adjustment ($t_0 + 4\delta t + t_0 + t_0 < t$)

If there is no error and the lander follows the reference trajectory precisely, it will arrive at the switching altitude to the next subphase at the objective point. However, there are always guidance and control errors which can cause the lander be above the switching altitude at the final point of the subphase. This step is therefore introduced to compensate this. The lander is expected to descend vertically to the altitude of $x_6$ with a con-
stant velocity \( v_0, \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t_\tau) &= 0, \\
R_x(t_\tau) &= 0, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t}, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} = 0, \\
x_t(t_\tau) &= x_t, \\
y_t(t_\tau) &= y_t,
\end{align*}
\]

(t_\tau = t - t_{f1} - 4dt - t_b - t_d)

where \((v_{x,t}, v_{x,b})\) and \((s_{x,t}, y_{t})\) are reference velocity and position at the end of the Step 6.

Step 3: Horizontal deceleration \((t_\eta + \delta t \leq t \leq t_\eta + \delta t + t_d)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t_\tau) &= \Psi, \\
R_x(t_\tau) &= 0, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} + (\cos \Psi - g_{m})t_\tau, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} + s_{x,t}\sin(\Psi)t_\tau, \\
x_t(t_\tau) &= x_t + v_{x,t}t_\tau + \frac{1}{2}(\cos \Psi - g_{m})t_\tau^2, \\
y_t(t_\tau) &= y_t + v_{x,t}t_\tau + \frac{1}{2}s_{x,t}\sin(\Psi)t_\tau^2, \\
(t_\tau &= t - t_{f1} - \delta t).
\end{align*}
\]

Step 4: Transition to freefall \((t_\eta + \delta t + t_d \leq t \leq t_\eta + 2\delta t + t_d)\)

The lander stops horizontal deceleration and returns to vertical attitude with constant angular velocity \(-\omega [\text{rad/sec}].\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t_\tau) &= s_{x,t}\sin(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau), \\
R_x(t_\tau) &= -s_{x,t}\bar{\omega}, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} - g_{m}t_\tau - \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\sin(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \sin(\Psi)t_\tau, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} + s_{x,t}\cos(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \cos(\Psi)t_\tau, \\
x_t(t_\tau) &= x_t + \left(v_{x,t} + \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\cos(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \cos(\Psi)t_\tau\right) \tau_1 + \frac{1}{2}g_{m}\tau_1^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\left[\cos(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \cos(\Psi)\right], \\
y_t(t_\tau) &= y_t + \left(v_{x,t} - \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\cos(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau)\right) \tau_1 \\
&\quad - \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\left[\sin(\Psi - \bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \sin(\Psi)\right], \\
(t_\tau &= t - t_{f1} - \delta t - t_d).
\end{align*}
\]

Step 5: Secondary freefall \((t_\eta + 2\delta t + t_d \leq t \leq t_\eta + 2\delta t + t_d + t_d)\)

The lander freefalls again for \(t_2\) seconds, again.

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t_\tau) &= 0, \\
R_x(t_\tau) &= 0, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} - g_{m}t_\tau, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} + s_{x,t}\sin(\Psi), \\
x_t(t_\tau) &= x_t + v_{x,t}t_\tau - \frac{1}{2}g_{m}\tau_2^2, \\
y_t(t_\tau) &= y_t + v_{x,t}t_\tau, \\
(t_\tau &= t - t_{f2} - 2\delta t - t_d).
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3: The sequence of the reference trajectory type 1. Transition steps are omitted in this figure.

Trajectory type 2: horizontal deceleration only

At the start of the subphase, the lander freefalls \((t_{f1}\text{sec})\), then decelerates horizontally \((t_{f2}\text{sec})\). It then freefalls again \((t_{f3}\text{sec})\), then decelerates vertically \((t_d)\). The direction of deceleration depends on the initial and final horizontal velocities. Let \(s_2\) denote

\[
s_2 = \operatorname{sign}(v_x - v_y).
\]

Step 1: Freefall \((t \leq t_{f1})\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t) &= 0, \\
R_x(t) &= 0, \\
v_{x,t}(t) &= v_{x,t} - g_{m}t, \\
v_{x,t}(t) &= v_{x,t} + s_{x,t}, \\
x_t(t) &= x_t + v_{x,t}t - \frac{1}{2}g_{m}t^2, \\
y_t(t) &= y_t + v_{y,t}t.
\end{align*}
\]

Step 2: Transition to horizontal deceleration \((t_{f1} \leq t \leq t_{f1} + \delta t)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_x(t_\tau) &= s_{x,t}\bar{\omega}t, \\
R_x(t_\tau) &= s_{x,t}\bar{\omega}, \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} - g_{m}t_\tau + \frac{s_{x,t}}{\omega}\sin(\bar{\omega}t_\tau), \\
v_{x,t}(t_\tau) &= v_{x,t} + s_{x,t}\cos(\bar{\omega}t_\tau) - \cos(\bar{\omega})t_\tau, \\
x_t(t_\tau) &= x_t + v_{x,t}t_\tau - \frac{1}{2}g_{m}t_\tau^2, \\
y_t(t_\tau) &= y_t + v_{y,t}t_\tau, \\
(t_\tau &= t - t_{f1} - \delta t).
\end{align*}
\]
Step 6: Vertical deceleration \((t_{\eta} + 2\delta t + t_d + t_2 + t_0)\) 

The lander vertically decelerates for \(t_0\) seconds.

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_s(\tau_s) &= 0, \\
R_s(\tau_s) &= 0, \\
v_x(\tau_s) &= v_{x_0} + (a - g_m)\tau_s, \\
v_y(\tau_s) &= v_{y_0}, \\
x_s(\tau_s) &= x_s + v_{x_0}\tau_s + \frac{1}{2}(a - g_m)\tau_s^2, \\
y_s(\tau_s) &= y_s + v_{y_0}\tau_s, \\
(\tau_s &= t - t_{\eta} - 2\delta t - t_d).
\end{align*}
\]

Step 7: Altitude adjustment \((t_{\eta} + 2\delta t + t_d + t_2 + t_0 < t)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi_s(\tau_s) &= 0, \\
R_s(\tau_s) &= 0, \\
v_x(\tau_s) &= v_{x_0}, \\
v_y(\tau_s) &= v_{y_0} = 0, \\
x_s(\tau_s) &= x_s, \\
y_s(\tau_s) &= y_s, \\
(\tau_s &= t - t_{\eta} - 2\delta t - t_d - t_2).
\end{align*}
\]

3.3.3 Increasing Computational Efficiency

Determining the reference trajectory: If there is no error, the lander reaches the switching altitude to the next subphase at the end of step 6 for both types of trajectory. The boundary conditions for step 6 are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
v_{y_0} &= v_{y_f}, \\
v_{x_0} &= v_{y_f} = 0, \\
x_0 &= x_f, \\
y_0 &= y_f,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(v_{y_0}, x_0, y_0\) are set according to the subphase or are obtained from the obstacle detection system. For four boundary conditions, we have six unknown parameters of \(t_{\eta}, t_0, t_d, t_2, \Psi, \alpha, v_{y_0}\) for the type 1 trajectory type 1 and seven parameters of \(t_{\eta}, t_0, t_d, t_2, \Psi, \alpha, v_{y_0}\) for trajectory type 2. Since the number of unknown parameters is greater than the number of conditions, we can minimize fuel consumption in both cases. We have the following relationships for mass flow

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m} &= -\frac{T}{I_{\text{SG}}} = \frac{T_{\text{SG}}y_T}{I_{\text{SG}}} = -\alpha m, \\
\Rightarrow m &= m_{y_0}e^{-\alpha t}, \quad (\alpha: \text{thrust duty cycle})
\end{align*}
\]

so the fuel consumption in the current subphase is

\[
\Delta m = m_0(1 - e^{-\alpha \Delta t}), \quad (8)
\]

where

\[
\Delta t = \begin{cases} 
  t_0 + t_d + \frac{a}{g_m} & \text{(type 1)} \\
  t_0 + t_0 + \frac{a}{g_m} & \text{(type 2)}
\end{cases}
\]

As mentioned above, the reference trajectory is determined by choosing parameters to minimize the fuel consumption.

Determination of descent velocity at subphase change

The optimization problem is solved numerically to generate the reference trajectory. In this study, Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP) method \([10]\) is applied to solve this optimization problem. The computer program of SQP method is provided in Matlab toolbox\(^1\).

The amount of computation required for this optimization depends greatly on the number of unknown parameters. Accordingly, the descent velocity at the end of each subphase should be determined by off-line optimization to fix one of unknown parameters beforehand.

When the reference trajectory is generated, the horizontal travel distance to avoid obstacles in the next subphase is unknown. Therefore, the initial descent velocity for the next subphase, which is the final descent velocity for the current subphase, is determined \textit{a priori} by the following approach. The final horizontal velocity is assumed to be 0, and the horizontal travel distance in the next subphase is assumed to be the maximum estimated distance corresponding to \(3\sigma\). Since the horizontal velocity is 0 m/s, the reference trajectory is assumed to be type 1. The mass of the vehicle is assumed to be the maximum estimate, which is the severest condition for fuel consumption. Under these assumptions, the final descent velocity for the current subphase is optimized in order to minimize the fuel consumption. This is typical min-max problem approach.

Table 2 shows the conditions and the optimal initial descent velocity for the rough obstacle avoidance and precise obstacle avoidance subphases. From this result, the final descent velocity \(v_{y_0}\) for the navigation error ac-

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
subphase & rough & precise \\
\hline
initial altitude & 500m & 100m \\
initial mass & 540kg & 520kg \\
horizontal velocity & 0m/s & 0m/s \\
travel distance & 290m & 20m \\
final altitude & 100m & 10m \\
\hline
initial descending velocity & 13m/s & 6m/s \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Appropriate initial descending velocity and subphase conditions}
\end{table}

\(^1\text{(c) Mathworks)\)
commodation and approximate obstacle avoidance
subphases are 13 m/s and 6 m/s respectively.

Reachable range In this problem, there is a typical
optimization problem difficulty in generating the refer-
ence trajectory, namely the large influence of the initial
solution on the success of solving the problem. In our
approach, the reachable range under the current condi-
tion is investigated and it is used to generate the initial
solution.

Each of the following cases is investigated to survey
the reachable range:

1. Trajectory type 1, $\psi > 0$
2. Trajectory type 1, $\psi < 0$
3. Trajectory type 2

Maximization and minimization of $y_{6}$ is conducted for
each case. Each set of maximum and minimum value
defines the range where the spacecraft can reach in the
case (Figure 4). If the travel distance exists within one of
these reachable ranges, the initial solution is set to be
one of the boundary value and the optimization problem
is solved to generate the reference trajectory. Since case
1 and case 2 never covers the same region, the travel dis-
tance can exist within two reachable ranges. In this cir-
cumstance, the optimization problem is solved for each
cases. This optimization problem has the desirable char-
acteristic that $y_{6}$ in each problem changes with respect to
$\psi$ and converges easily. Thus, we can achieve the reac-
achable range under the boundary conditions, and we can
easily choose the initial solution with appropriate sign of
$\psi$ and the reference trajectory is obtained in short time,
even if the optimization problem is solved twice. As a
result of this approach, we can obtain a reference traject-
ory in almost all cases, and if the required travel distance
does not lie within the reachable range, the closest point
is chosen as a feasible value of $y_{6}$.

3.4 Guidance to the Reference Trajectory

This module calculates commands for the main thrust
and attitude control, which enables the lander to follow
the reference trajectory. It consists of two parts:
"calculation of the current reference states" and
"guidance."

3.4.1 Calculation of the Current Reference States

In this part, the current reference states (reference
position and velocity) are calculated using elapsed time
and parameters of the reference trajectory which are ob-
tained from "subphase management" module. Current
reference position and velocity can be obtained based on
the equation of motion in the reference trajectory coordi-
nates. They are transformed to the lunar local coordi-
ate by $C_{1}$ and used in the next part.

3.4.2 Guidance

The thrust, angular velocity and attitude commands are
calculated by the following steps:

- Calculate nominal forces along each axis of the lunar
  local coordinate system ($F_{x}$, $F_{y}$, $F_{z}$) using the
  current reference states.
- The differences between the reference and current
  states are multiplied by some gains and fed back to the
  forces $F_{x}$, $F_{y}$, and $F_{z}$.
- Calculate thrust and attitude commands to achieve
  the calculated command forces $F_{c}$. If it is im-
  possible to achieve all $F_{c}$ because of attitude or thrust
  command limits, compromise solutions are chosen.

First, nominal forces are calculated using the $\phi_{0}$ (de-
defined in (3)), $\psi$, and a obtained from the reference traject-
ory generation module and the estimated mass $m_{e}$ ob-
tained from the mass estimation module.

$$
C_{1} = \begin{bmatrix}
cos \psi & -sin \psi & 0 \\
sin \psi & cos \psi & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

$$
F_{c} = \begin{bmatrix}
cos \phi \cdot cos \psi \\
cos \phi \cdot sin \psi \\
sin \phi \cdot cos \psi \\
sin \phi \cdot sin \psi
\end{bmatrix} T
$$

Figure 4: Reachable range by these cases
where $C_q^r$ is the transformation matrix from the reference trajectory coordinate system to the lunar local coordinate system defined in (2). Feedback terms are added to the nominal forces as follows:

$$ F_{z,a}^l = \max\{0, F_{z,a}^l + FB_{z,a}\} $$

$$ F_{z,a}^l = 0, \text{ if } F_{z,a}^l > (F_{z,a}^l + FB_{z,a}) < 0, $$

$$ F_{z,a}^l = F_{z,a}^l + FB_{z,a}, \text{ otherwise.} $$

$$ \text{where}\quad FB_{z,a} = (K_{\Delta \nu} + K_{\Delta \nu} m_{\nu}), \quad FB_{z,a} = (K_{\Delta \nu} + K_{\Delta \nu} m_{\nu}), $$

$$ \Delta \nu = \nu - \nu, \Delta \sigma = \sigma - \sigma $$

where

- $v^l$ : current velocity
- $u^l$ : current position
- $v^l$ : current reference velocity
- $u^l$ : current reference position

(in the lunar local coordinate system).

$F_{z,a}^l$ is always greater than zero since the main thruster does not have a gimbal mechanism. Note that if the signs of $F_{z,a}^l$ and $F_{z,a}^l$ differ after adding feedback terms $FB_{z,a}$, $F_{z,a}^l$ and $F_{z,a}^l$ are set to zero in order to prevent oscillatory behavior around the reference trajectory.

Command inputs $uT_a$, $\theta_a$ and $\psi_a$ are calculated to realize the $F_{z,a}^l$.

$$ C_q^r(\theta_a, \psi_a, \phi_a) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_a \\
\cos \theta_a \sin \phi_a \\
\sin \theta_a \sin \phi_a \end{bmatrix} $$

where $P_a$, $Q_a$, $R_a$ are roll, pitch, yaw angular velocity commands respectively.

**Case B:** if $F_{z,a}^l = 0$ It is impossible to realize $F_{z,a}^l$ and $F_{z,a}^l$ without excess of angles. Thus, $uT_a$ should be zero and reference angles should be used as command inputs:

$$ uT_a = 0, $$

$$ C_q^r(\theta_a, \psi_a, \phi_a) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_a \\
\cos \theta_a \sin \phi_a \\
\sin \theta_a \sin \phi_a \end{bmatrix} $$

$$ \theta_a = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sin \phi_a \sin \phi_a - \sin \phi_a \tan \psi_a}{\cos \phi_a \tan \psi_a + \sin \phi_a \sin \phi_a}\right), $$

$$ \psi_a = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\cos \phi_a \sin \psi_a + \sin \phi_a \sin \phi_a \sin \psi_a}{\cos \phi_a \sin \psi_a + \sin \phi_a \sin \phi_a \sin \psi_a}\right), $$

$$ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_a}{Q_a} \\
\frac{Q_a}{R_a} \end{bmatrix} = C_q^r(\theta_a, \psi_a, \phi_a) C_q^r(\phi_a) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix}, $$

$$ (C_q^r)^{-1}.$$  

Note that the angular velocity commands should be defined in the target attitude coordinates.

**Case C:** otherwise Calculate the command inputs using $F_{z,a}^l$.

$$ \phi_a = \phi_a, $$

$$ \theta_a = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{F_{z,a}^l \sin \phi_a - F_{z,a}^l \cos \phi_a}{F_{z,a}^l}\right), $$

$$ \psi_a = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{F_{z,a}^l \cos \phi_a + F_{z,a}^l \sin \phi_a \cdot \cos \theta_a}{F_{z,a}^l}\right), $$

$$ uT_a = \frac{F_{z,a}^l}{T_{\max} \cos \theta_a \cos \psi_a}, $$

$$ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_a}{Q_a} \\
\frac{Q_a}{R_a} \end{bmatrix} = C_q^r(\theta_a, \psi_a, \phi_a) C_q^r(\phi_a) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix}, $$

If some of the commands exceed the limits, that is, $\theta_a > \theta_{\max}$ or $\psi_a > \psi_{\max}$ or $uT_a > 1$, these should be re-calculated as follows:

- If $F_{z,a}^l > T_{\max} \cos \theta_{\max} \cos \psi_{\max}$ then $F_{z,a}^l$ cannot be realized within the limits in this case. Thus $uT_a$ should be set to 1 to maximize $F_{z,a}^l$. Attitude commands, $\theta_a$ and $\psi_a$, should be calculated again.

$$ uT_a = 1, $$

$$ \psi_a = \psi_{\max} \cdot \text{sign}(\mathcal{R}_a), \text{ if } \left|\sin^{-1}\mathcal{R}_a - \psi_{\max}\right| < \sin^{-1}\mathcal{R}_a, \text{ otherwise, } $$

$$ \theta_a = \theta_{\max} \cdot \text{sign}(\mathcal{R}_a), \text{ if } \left|\sin^{-1}\mathcal{R}_a - \theta_{\max}\right| < \left|\sin^{-1}\mathcal{R}_a\right|, \text{ otherwise. } $$
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where \( R_c = \frac{F_{xc} \cos \phi_c + F_{yc} \sin \phi_c}{T_{max}} \),
\( R_s = \frac{F_{xs} \cos \phi_s - F_{ys} \cos \phi_s}{T_{max}} \cos \psi_a \).

- Otherwise

Either \( F_{xc,s} \) or \( F_{xs,s} \) (or both) cannot be realized. In this case, the command inputs are re-calculated so that \( F_{xc,s} \) and \( F_{xs,s} \) are maximized within the limits with keeping \( F_{vc,s} \approx F_{vs,s} \).

\[ \begin{align*}
\theta_a &= \begin{cases}
\theta_{max} \cdot \text{sign}(R_c), & \text{if } \tan^{-1} R_c > \theta_{max}, \\
\tan^{-1} R_c, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}, \\
\psi_a &= \begin{cases}
\psi_{max} \cdot \text{sign}(R_s), & \text{if } \tan^{-1} R_s > \psi_{max}, \\
\tan^{-1} R_s, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}, \\
T_{oa} &= \frac{F_{vc,s}}{T_{max} \cos \theta_a \cos \psi_a}, \\
\text{where } R_c &= \frac{F_{xc,s} \cos \phi_s + F_{yc,s} \sin \phi_s}{F_{vc,s}}, \\
R_s &= \frac{F_{xs,s} \cos \phi_s - F_{ys,s} \sin \phi_s}{F_{vs,s}}.
\end{align*} \]

3.5 Main Thrust Modulation

Although the main thruster in this study operates only in a pulse mode (simple on-off), almost arbitrary thrust levels can be achieved by modulating the width of the activation pulses proportionally to the magnitude of the thrust command input (so-called pulse width modulation (PWM)). In this case, the minimum on-time and off-time of the thruster are greater than the sampling period of the guidance system. Thus, modulation is applied so that the average thrust within several sampling periods approximates the thrust command input.

This module is composed of two parts depicted in Figure 5. In the “pulse calculator” part, on-time and off-time of a pulse is calculated based on the thrust command input, and the pulse is generated in the “pulse generator” part. The pulse generator outputs “1” for the time of \( t_{on} \) seconds and outputs “0” for the time of \( t_{off} \) seconds. After outputting “0”, it triggers the pulse calculator.

3.5.1 Pulse Calculator

This calculates on-time and off-time of an output pulse according to the level of the thrust command input \( u T_a \). The minimum on-time (\( T_{on,min} \)) and off-time (\( T_{off,min} \)) of the thruster should be considered in the calculation.

\[ u T_a \leq u T_a \leq \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min}}. \]

In order to achieve the thrust level \( u T_a \) on an average, more than \( T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min} \) seconds are necessary, which is too long compared to the sampling period. Thus the pulse is not generated (\( t_{on} = 0, t_{off} = T_{off,min} \)) and the current value of \( u T_a \) is carried forward to the next period’s value to prevent lack of the thrust.

\[ \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min}} \leq u T_a \leq \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min}}. \]

In this case, \( t_{on} \) is fixed at \( T_{on,min} \) and \( t_{off} \) is calculated so as to achieve the thrust command level \( u T_a \):

\[ t_{off} = T_{on,min} \times \frac{1 - u T_a}{u T_a}. \]

Using the calculated \( t_{off} \), the output \( u T \) approximates the thrust command level on the average.

\[ \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min}} \leq u T_a \leq \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + 2 \cdot T_{off,min}}. \]

As opposed to the previous case, \( t_{on} \) is fixed at \( T_{on,min} \) and \( t_{off} \) is calculated as follows:

\[ t_{on} = T_{off,min} \times \frac{u T_a}{1 - u T_a}. \]

\[ \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + T_{off,min}} \leq u T_a \leq \frac{T_{on,min}}{T_{on,min} + T_{off,min}}. \]

Since more than \( 2 \cdot T_{on,min} + T_{off,min} \) seconds, which is too long compared to the guidance cycle, are necessary to achieve the thrust command level, \( t_{on} \) is set at \( T_{on,min} \). Although this may cause excessive thrust, it is not a problem for safe landing.

3.5.2 Pulse Generator

The pulse command \( u T \) is generated during the time of \( (t_{on} + t_{off}) \) seconds. The elapsed time from the beginning of the pulse command is counted by the pulse counter. The initial value of the counter is zero. When it counts \( (t_{on} + t_{off}) \) seconds, it is reset and the pulse calculator part is
triggered.

3.6 Attitude Control
This module calculates RCS torques from commands, current angles and angular velocities:

\[ T_r = K_{p_r}(\theta_r - \phi) + K_{d_r}(P_r - P), \]
\[ T_p = K_{p_p}(\theta_p - \theta) + K_{d_p}(Q_p - Q), \]
\[ T_q = K_{p_q}(\psi_q - \psi) + K_{d_q}(R_q - R). \]  
(14)

where \(P, Q\) and \(R\) are current angular velocities.

3.7 Mass Estimation
This module estimates the current mass of the lander. The fuel consumption rate is calculated as:

\[ \frac{dm}{dt} = -\frac{T}{g \cdot I_{gy}} = -\frac{T_{max} \cdot u_T}{g \cdot I_{gy}}. \]

Therefore, the mass is estimated by the following equation:

\[ m_r = m_0 - \int_a^t \frac{T_{max} \cdot u_T}{g \cdot I_{gy}} dt. \]  
(15)

4. Monte Carlo Simulation with the Nominal Configuration

4.1 Types of Uncertainties
Monte Carlo simulations of lunar landing were conducted to validate the guidance and control system and to evaluate its robustness against uncertainty. Various uncertain parameters and their distributions are assumed in the simulation. Table 3 shows the uncertain parameters considered here. Parameter values are generated randomly with their assumed distributions at each iteration. Apart from these parameters, small random noise is also included in the IMU and RA/RV outputs.

4.2 Success Criteria
The landing experiment has two main objectives:

- precise landing at the target site,
- safe landing on the moon.

The lander should achieve the mission success criterion for each objective.

---

Table 3: Uncertain parameters in Monte Carlo simulation (1σ value).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>IMU (1: accelerometer) (2: gyro)</th>
<th>Bias Error</th>
<th>60.0μgJ G(^{-1}) (^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Factor</td>
<td>100.0ppm (^{1}) (^{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Alignment</td>
<td>200.0μrad (^{1}) (^{4})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Walk</td>
<td>0.01[deg/hr] (^{2}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA/RV (3: RA) (4: RV)</td>
<td>Bias Error</td>
<td>0.5[m] (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Factor</td>
<td>0.2[m/sec] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Alignment</td>
<td>0.5[rad] (^{1}) (^{4})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacle Detection</td>
<td>Bias Error</td>
<td>1.0[%]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Factor</td>
<td>1.0[%] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Alignment</td>
<td>1.0[deg] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Point</td>
<td>68.354[m] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.714[m] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5: Rough avoidance subphase, 6: Precise avoidance subphase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lander Model</th>
<th>Thruster (7: Thrust) (8: I)</th>
<th>Bias Error</th>
<th>10.0[N] (^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Factor</td>
<td>0.6667[kgf \cdot sec/kg] (^{3})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Alignment</td>
<td>1.5[%] (^{1}) (^{4})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Gravitational Acceleration</th>
<th>Bias Error</th>
<th>0.001[m/sec] (^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>0.0[m] (^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velocity</td>
<td>117.851[m] (^{1}) (^{1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>0.0[m/sec] (^{1}) (^{3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Navigation Error</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>10.0[m] (^{1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velocity</td>
<td>6.0[m] (^{1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.13[arcmin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Condition</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>0.0[m] (^{1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velocity</td>
<td>4.0[m] (^{1})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9: Altitude, 10: East & North)

4.2.1 Precise Landing
An initial navigation error exists at the beginning of the vertical descent phase. Since the lander is required to land at an obstacle-free area in the vicinity of the target site, it must be in a position where the obstacle detection system can capture the target site at the beginning of the rough obstacle avoidance subphase. Since the angle of view of the obstacle detection system's stereo cameras is 30 degrees, the success criterion is as follows:

Criterion-1 Horizontal position error is less than 134 meters (= tan \(\frac{30°}{2}\) x 500) at the start of the rough obstacle avoidance subphase.
4.2.2 Safe Landing

In the simulation, the central peak of a crater and a lava dome in the lunar highlands are supposed to be the leading candidates for a target site. It has been proved in our previous study [9] that around these regions there is at least one $10\,\text{m} \times 10\,\text{m}$ or wider obstacle-free square area within a distance of 325m, which is the maximum side shift achievable after the rough and precise obstacle avoidance subphases.

Considering the size of the lander is about 4m and the fact that the obstacle detection system can detect a safety area of $10\,\text{m} \times 10\,\text{m}$ (or wider), we obtain Criterion-2 as follows:

Criterion-2 Horizontal position error at touchdown is less than 3m ($- (10 - 4)/2$).

Added to these are the following criteria mentioned in section 2:

Criterion-3 The maximum descent velocity at touchdown is 3m/s, and

Criterion-4 The main thruster is cut-off above 2m.

4.3 Simulation Results

A Monte Carlo simulation was carried out with 1,000 iterations. Figure 6-9 show the results, which are also summarized in Table 4.

The distribution of the position error at the start of rough obstacle avoidance subphase is shown in Fig. 6. The mean value of the error is 51.67m and the $3\sigma$ value is 79.38m. The error exceeds 134m in only three cases out of 1,000. Figure 7 shows position error at touchdown. The mean value of the error is 11.03m and the $3\sigma$ value is 17.69m. It follows from these results that Criterion-1 is satisfied and precise landing within 30m of the objective point is achievable.

However, for Criterion-2, the position error at touchdown exceeds the 3m limit in 942 cases. Furthermore,

![Figure 6: Distribution of position error at the start of the rough obstacle avoidance subphase. The magnitude is within 134[m] in 997 cases.](image)

![Figure 7: Distribution of position error at touchdown. The magnitude is within 3[m] in 58 cases.](image)

![Figure 8: Distribution of descent velocity at touchdown. The velocity is within 3[m/s] in 531 cases.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
<th>$1\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position error$^1$</td>
<td>51.67[m]</td>
<td>26.46[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position error$^2$</td>
<td>11.04[m]</td>
<td>5.897[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance error$^2$</td>
<td>0.2537[m]</td>
<td>0.1378[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending velocity$^2$</td>
<td>3.017[m/s]</td>
<td>1.199[m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal velocity$^2$</td>
<td>0.3690[m/s]</td>
<td>0.2129[m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last pulse</td>
<td>2.788[m]</td>
<td>2.661[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel consumption</td>
<td>57.60[kg]</td>
<td>2.161[kg]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1: at the beginning of rough avoidance subphase.
*2: at touchdown.
Criterion-3 and Criterion-4 fail to be satisfied in almost half of the cases. The descent velocity exceeds the limit in 469 cases (Fig. 8), as does the altitude of main engine cut-off in 479 cases (Fig. 9).

4.4 Discussion
Since the RA/RV is not available below 30m, the accuracy of the integrated navigation deteriorates at lower altitude. Considering the fact that the mean value of the guidance error at touchdown is 0.2537m, it is thought that excessive position error is caused mainly by navigation error. It follows that the lander needs to be equipped with another altimeter and velocimeter for lower altitudes in order to reduce the position error, or the landing sequence needs to be changed so that the lander can avoid all obstacles above 30m. If these are impossible, the target site should be changed to a flat area where distribution of obstacles is less than that considered in this paper.

For Criterion-3 and Criterion-4, since the mean value of descent velocity at the last thrust pulse is 1.202m/s, exceedences of the limits are supposed to be caused by altitude error. If the main thruster can stop exactly at an altitude of 2m, the touchdown velocity is expected to be less than 3m/s. One possible way to achieve this is to equip the lander with a 2m-long lunar surface-sensing probe that will trigger main thruster cut-off, as in the case of the Apollo Lunar Module, which had a 5-foot probe.

5. Monte Carlo Simulation with the Modified Configuration
The lander configuration and landing sequence are modified based on the discussion as in the following subsec-

Figure 9: Distribution of altitude of the main engine shutdown. It is above 2[m] in 521 cases.

5.1 Modified Lander Configuration and Landing Sequence
- Surface-sensing Probe
  The lander is equipped with a 2m-long lunar surface-sensing probe, which triggers main thruster cut-off to avoid stirring up lunar surface material (regolith) by using the main thruster near the surface. This is similar to the 5-foot probe used by the Apollo Lunar Module.

- Hovering Subphase
  The landing sequence is modified as follows:
  - Initial error accommodation (3,500m-500m altitude)
  - Rough obstacle avoidance (500m-150m)
  - Precise obstacle avoidance (150m-40m)
  - Hovering (around 40m)
  - Constant speed descent (40m-2m)
  - Freefall (2m-0m)

The hovering subphase is introduced to accommodate the horizontal position error accumulated during the precise obstacle avoidance subphase. The lander moves slowly to above the center of the obstacle-free area while maintaining an altitude of around 40m. This altitude is settled considering the fact that the RA/RV is not available below 30m, and the Monte Carlo simulation results which show that the maximum altitude error around 30m is about 10m.

During the hovering subphase, commands are calculated without nominal forces (that is, $\mathbf{F}_a = \mathbf{0}$). In the Table 5: Simulation results with the modified configuration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position error$^1$</td>
<td>51.58[m]</td>
<td>26.41[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position error$^2$</td>
<td>4.021[m]</td>
<td>4.199[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent velocity$^2$</td>
<td>2.778[m/s]</td>
<td>0.2369[m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal velocity$^2$</td>
<td>0.4190[m/s]</td>
<td>0.3641[m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last pulse</td>
<td>2.210[m]</td>
<td>0.5444[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel consumption</td>
<td>63.55[kg]</td>
<td>3.161[kg]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$: at the start of rough avoidance subphase.

$^2$: at touchdown.
Figure 10: Distribution of position error at the start of the rough obstacle avoidance subphase. The magnitude is within 134[m] in 997 cases.

Figure 12: Distribution of descent velocity at touchdown. The velocity is within 3[m/s] in 828 cases.

Figure 11: Distribution of position error at touchdown. The magnitude is within 3[m] in 488 cases.

Figure 13: Distribution of altitude of the main engine shutdown. It is above 2[m] in 664 cases.

\[(10) - (12)\]. The reference altitude \(z^d\) is set at 40m and the reference descent velocity \(v^d_r\) is set at 0m/s. The reference horizontal velocity varies between -2m/s and +2m/s depending on the horizontal distance to the objective point.

- Obstacle Detection System
  The obstacle detection system is used for estimating relative position between the lander and the obstacle-free area in order to reduce the horizontal position error from the beginning of the hovering subphase. The sampling period of the system is assumed to be one second and it is activated only when the main thruster is not firing.

5.2 Simulation Results
Figure 6-9 show the results of the 1,000 Monte Carlo simulation trials using the modified configuration, which are also summarized in Table 4.

The distribution of position error at the start of rough obstacle avoidance subphase is shown in Fig. 6. The error exceeds 134m in only three cases out of 1,000. It follows from these results that Criterion-1 is satisfied.

Figure 7 shows position error at touchdown. Compared to the SELENE-B configuration in which the error exceeded the 3m limit in 942 cases, the probability of success is obviously improved by the introduction of the hovering subphase. Although fuel consumption is greater compared to the SELENE-B result of 57.60kg, the increase is only a few kilograms and is considered to be acceptable.
The distributions of descent velocity and main engine cut-off altitude are shown in Fig. 8 and 9. Criterion-3 and Criterion-4 are satisfied in 828 cases and 664 cases respectively. The exceedence of the shutdown altitude limit in 336 cases in spite of the lunar surface-sensing probe is considered to be due to the main thruster’s response delay to the shut-off command and its minimum on-time.

6. Conclusion

We evaluated a guidance and control system for safe and precise landing on the moon with optimum fuel consumption by Monte Carlo simulation. It was shown that the system with modified configuration can achieve precise landing, and the error at landing is significantly lower compared to the original lander configuration. The main thruster shutdown altitude, however, exceeded its limit in about 34% of cases, and this does not give a satisfactorily high probability of safe landing. The algorithm for shutdown should therefore be modified in consideration of the delay and minimum on-time of the main thruster. Furthermore, position error at landing still failed to satisfy the 3m maximum criterion in almost half of the cases. We are planning to redesign the feedback gains during the hovering subphase in order to improve the results, which will be shown in future studies.
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